THE MYSORE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF 1910.

—o—

GENERAL SUBJECTS.

LEGISLATION.

(Nos. 1 to 23.)

SUBJECT No. 1.

Power of interpellation in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Ramanujaiengar, Gubbi Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—It is necessary to grant the members of the Legislative Council the right of interpellation. This will serve as an efficient check on the actions of some public servants and will also secure to the public timely information on all matters of public importance. The subject was mooted last year and early orders are solicited in the matter.

Mr. Venkatakrishnaiya added that, by granting the right of interpellation to the non-official members of the Legislative Council, the similar right vested in the members of the Representative Assembly would not be interfered with, and that consequently both the bodies may be allowed the privilege of interpellation.

Reply of Government.—Recorded.

SUBJECT No. 2.

Election of members to the Legislative Council.

(*a*) Mr. H. Surasastri, Chikballapur Taluk.
(*b*) Mr. A. Narasimha Iyengar, Sagar Taluk.
(*c*) Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao, Chikmagalur Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) The power of veto retained by the Government with regard to the election of members from the Representative Assembly to the Legislative Council is anomalous and should be dispensed with.

(*b*) A member may be allowed to be elected to the Legislative Council to represent the malnad districts of Kadur and Shimoga.

(*c*) One member may be elected to the Legislative Council from among the members of the Representative Assembly for the Nagar Division comprising the districts of Shimoga, Kadur and Chitaldrug.

(*a*) Mr. H. Surasastri added that non-official elected Representatives in the Council were very few—being only one or two—and that to restrict the field of choice in this manner would be a reflection on the Assembly itself. The members of the Assembly, who are men of respectability, might be trusted to elect only persons qualified by character and ability to represent them.

(*b*) and (*c*) Messrs. C. Srinivasa Rao and A. Narasimhaiengar contended for a separate representative in the Council for the malnad districts of the State, on the ground that the malnad has got distinctive characteristics of its own; and they therefore prayed for a reconsideration of the last Government Order on the subject. Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao added that Chitaldrug might be clubbed along with Shimoga and Chikmagalur for this purpose. Mr. H. Surasastri said that it was desirable to have at least one non-official member in the Council to represent each of the eight districts in the State.

Reply of Government.—The rules regarding election of members to the Legislative Council have been only recently framed and some experience of their working is necessary before they can be reconsidered. Their effect will be watched.

SUBJECT NO. 3.

The Representative Assembly to be consulted in all legislative measures.

Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao, Chikmagalur Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The opinion of the Representative Assembly should be taken before finally passing any important legislative measure passed in the Legislative Council. This was promised by Government in 1893 (Subject No. 9 of 1893) in the following words :—

"As to consulting the Dasara Representative Assembly regarding all Rules and Regulations, I have been and shall continue to do this in all important matters but cannot promise to do it in all."

Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao, speaking on this subject, said that a former representation on the same matter was negatived under a misapprehension by the Government, *viz.*, that the Representative Assembly was trying to place itself in the position of an "upper house" as compared with the Legislative Council. He added that the ryots had no opportunity of representing their grievances in the matter of legislation.

Mr. Venkatakrishnaiya also spoke in favor of the proposal and said that formerly the members of the Representative Assembly were being consulted in such matters.

Reply of Government.—There are practical inconveniences involved in the proposal under discussion. The members of this Assembly meet only once a year; and, even so, the members want to go away soon, *i.e.*, even before the completion of the proceedings. It is not, therefore, practicable to consult them at the various stages of a bill before the Legislative Council. There is, however, no room for complaint as, in matters of great importance, the members of the Assembly are, as a rule, consulted. For example, in the matter of the legislation regarding the disabilities of Christian converts, the Assembly was consulted last year. Last year the Assembly was requested to send